HON'BLE SHRI G.S.SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

WRIT PETITION No.20289 of 1996

Between:

Cherala Ramachandram & another. …Petitioners.

AND

Government of India, rep. by Deputy
Secretary to the Government, Ministry of
Home Affairs, Freedom Fighters Division,
New Delhi & others. …Respondents.

-

:: O R D E R ::

Counsel for the Petitioners : Sri I. Laxmikantha Rao

Counsel for Respondent No.1 : Sri A. Rajashekar Reddy,
Assistant Solicitor General.

Counsel for Respondent No.2 : Government Pleader for
Home.

Counsel for Respondent No.3 : Government Pleader for
Revenue.

Counsel for Respondent No.4 : Sri G.Vidyasagar.

13th JUNE 2006

In this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have complained against the alleged illegal withholding of pension payable to them under Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme, 1972 as amended in 1980.

On 8-6-2006, the Court, after taking cognisance of the averments contained in the writ petition, expressed displeasure over the stoppage of pension payable to the petitioners and directed respondent No.2 and Branch Manager of State Bank of Hyderabad, Huzurabad, Karimnagar District to appear in person.

Sri V.Ranga Rao, Deputy CID, Karimnagar and Sri B.Chandrakanth Gupta, Branch Manager, State Bank of Hyderabad, Huzurabad who are the persons holding the posts of respondent Nos.2 and 4 have appeared in person.

Sri G.Vidyasagar, learned counsel for State Bank of Hyderabad says that despite the seizure of the freedom fighters certificate of the petitioners by the police, the bank continued to pay pension to both the petitioners. According to him, freedom fighters pension payable to petitioner No.1 has been released even for the month of May, 2006. As regards petitioner No.2, Sri Vidyasagar gave out that his account was closed on 24th December, 2002.

Learned counsel for the petitioners says that petitioner No.2 has not contacted him for the last more than nine years. This gives an impression that petitioner No.2 is not interested in prosecuting his case.

In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

G.S. SINGHVI, C.J.

13th June, 2006.

ARS